

any action with the Administration. He also was adamant that he had very limited contacts with Fowler – from his viewpoint, they ran competing fund-raising institutions in 1995 – and that he certainly would not work with Fowler on any matter of substance. However, he did acknowledge that he had been made aware of the Hudson application by this point in time by Patrick O'Connor.

Havenick related his story of the meeting with McAuliffe to several people, including the applicant tribal leaders and lobbyist Platt. Platt, who had known McAuliffe for years,<sup>497</sup> wrote to him on Aug. 18. While indicating that the tribes had wanted to resort to public disclosure or litigation, Platt intimated his desire to resolve the matter quietly. Platt requested a meeting with McAuliffe, but did not mention what he had heard from Havenick.

Meanwhile, Platt sought a meeting with Fowler to raise the specter of litigation in pursuit of a favorable resolution. On Aug. 28, he called and, through staff, requested a meeting alone with Fowler, which Fowler granted for the next day. On Aug. 29, Fowler and Platt met at the DNC, and Platt provided Fowler a copy of Platt's Aug. 4 letter to Babbitt, as well as O'Connor's May 8 letter to Ickes. Platt claims that he told Fowler that the applicants were prepared to allege improper political interference in the decision by, among others, Fowler himself, and that Platt wished to offer Fowler a friendly heads-up. Fowler reviewed the letters, became quiet and said he did not want to discuss further the Hudson matter. Fowler disputes this version, saying that he

---

<sup>497</sup>Platt describes McAuliffe as an old friend, and stated that it would not surprise him if McAuliffe took credit for the decision and puffed up his role, even if he played no part.